

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 20 July 1978

The SPEAKER (Hon. G. R. Langley) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

Mrs. ADAMSON presented a petition signed by 2 544 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would take all necessary steps as a matter of extreme urgency to prohibit the sale of pornographic literature of any sort in South Australia, in the interests of and for the welfare of the children in this State.

Petition received.

PETITION: NET FISHING

Mr. BLACKER presented a petition signed by 454 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to introduce legislation that would prohibit net fishing within the area from Tumbly Island to the north-east corner of section 225, hundred of Hutchison.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. TONKIN: I cannot help commenting on the paucity of Ministers on the front bench. Will the Premier say what assistance the Government is prepared to make available to enable the Public Accounts Committee to complete its investigation into the Hospitals Department as a matter of urgency, and will the Premier assure this House that the committee will receive every co-operation from the Auditor-General's Department and all other Government departments? The report of the Corbett Committee on consumables at Government institutions tabled yesterday reveals that it was a cursory one conducted by senior Government departmental officers, operating within a time span of only six weeks, involving only seven country institutions and one smaller metropolitan hospital (Hillcrest), and that not all members visited each establishment. It also found that there "may be pilfering from time to time, or other dishonest practices", and that wastage of meat is occurring at the institutions visited. In this way, it confirms the urgent need for the Public Accounts Committee, which has been meeting on this subject since 2 December 1976, to complete its investigations and to bring down a report to this House as soon as possible.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member gave an explanation which had absolutely nothing to do with his question. His question was, whether the Government would give assistance to the Public Accounts Committee. I have received no request from the Public Accounts Committee to provide more assistance than is already available to it.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you got them to go slow, though?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly not, not in any way.

Mr. Millhouse: Have they already prepared the draft reports?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of reports being available from the Public Accounts Committee. If they are available to the member for Mitcham they certainly have not been available to me.

If there is any request for additional assistance from a Public Accounts Committee, we will be happy to assist it. I have received no such request for assistance. Indeed, the Leader did not point to a single instance where the committee had failed to get co-operation from the Government: of course they will get it.

Mr. Chapman: Take the dogs off them and let them get on with the job.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. I will follow the course I have followed during this week if honourable members do not cease interjecting.

UNEMPLOYMENT LEVEL

Mr. ABBOTT: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware of the predicted level of 500 000 or more unemployed by January next year, which is a prediction made by officers of the Commonwealth Employment and Industrial Relations Department? Further, has the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations made that report available to State Labor Ministers? I refer to the articles in the Melbourne Age and the Adelaide News yesterday stating that more than 500 000 people could be out of work by January, according to a report prepared by the Federal Department of Employment and Industrial Relations. It was reported that senior officials were yesterday briefing the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr. Street) on Australia's immediate and medium-term employment prospects. The report continued, as follows:

The projection that more than 500 000 people will be out of work in January compares with last month's unemployment level of just under 394 000.

The report states that the department's predictions for January next year are based on the assumption that the Government will not alter its present hard-line economic policy designed to bring down inflation, despite the warning by the shadow Employment and Industrial Relations Minister (Mr. Young), who has persistently warned that unemployment would top 500 000 early next year. The report also states:

Canberra sources say that while some rethinking may be necessary on future projections of the number of jobless, the Budget is unlikely to significantly alter the January prediction.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The question is in two parts. First, the honourable member has asked me whether I have had any advice from the Federal Minister, and I have to report that I have not. I have not had any projection reports regarding the unemployment position during the time I have been Minister, nor have I sighted this particular report. As a consequence of reading the press statements yesterday, I decided this morning that I should send two telegrams. The first one, addressed to the Hon. A. A. Street, M.H.R., Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, states:

Media coverage indicates report by your officers predicts at least 500 000 unemployed by January next. In view of serious implications of that prediction request copy of report be made available urgently to all State Ministers of Labour.

The other telegram is to the other State Ministers, advising them of my telegram to the Hon. A. A. Street, and asking them to make urgent requests also. We find ourselves in an unusual set of circumstances at present, because over the past year or so all prominent Labor speakers throughout Australia have been forecasting the same number of people as the department now says will be unemployed in 1978. That has been the prediction. Mr. Young has been more strongly voicing his opinion lately and saying that, by the middle of next year, between 500 000 and 600 000 will be unemployed. The economic experts attached to the Federal Liberal Government told the people of Australia in 1975 that the Labor Party could not manage and they paraded as experts on the economy of the country. Even Fraser, as late as last year, made the point to the Australian community that, in 1978, there would be a reduction in the unemployed in Australia.

The absolute reverse has happened, because of the hard-line policies of the Federal Government. Dramatic changes must be made within the next few weeks: we have not got months to play with. The policies must change almost overnight, otherwise employment will be heading towards a crisis similar to that of the depression days. I do not think anyone in Australia in his right mind would want that situation to develop. The Federal Government has done nothing but tighten the purse strings and restrict the States so much that they have had to tighten their belts, thus creating further unemployment. I know that all other capitalist countries in the world that have problems of this kind have made up their minds that, if private employers are not going to recreate a situation of full employment or of working towards it, the Government concerned must accept the responsibility to do so. I certainly believe that, if the right initiatives are taken and if the Government will release the purse strings, putting more money into the economy and commencing immediate job creation schemes, that could be the solution. All other capitalist countries in the world are creating jobs, thus escalating the economy throughout the community, and, as a consequence, employment is picking up in all those countries.

Mr. Venning: What a story!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Whether it is true or false, I suggest that the member for Rocky River should take it up with the American Government, which is doing it quite successfully and pouring in many millions of dollars. There is no doubt that this country is heading for the worst crisis in its time. I do not think anyone, even members on the other side, would want to see a situation of 500 000 people unemployed. We were told by the Federal Government that it would reduce the number of unemployed in this country, but what has happened has been absolutely the reverse. Since that Government took office, 137 000 more people have become unemployed. That Government promised the people of this nation that it could manage the affairs of this country better than the Labor Party could.

Mr. Venning: You've done nothing about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Rocky River to order.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I want to make a last plea to members opposite, who diligently follow the policies of the Federal Government, and who never criticise that Government, but who at all times are its lackeys. I ask them for once to get off their tails and stop being lackeys, and to make a plea to the Federal Government to follow the policies of the Labor Party, and then the economy might pick up.

CORBETT REPORT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say what were the facts uncovered by the Hospitals Department inquiries into the use of meat in hospitals which caused alarm and led to the setting up of the Corbett Committee? The reason given by Corbett for the establishment of that committee was that the Hospitals Department had conducted some investigations which caused alarm at the possibility of theft.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The information came to me, as Premier, in respect to a hospital institution in which there was not adequate control of food supplies. It came despite the fact that the Hospitals Department, through its officers, had assured me that processes had been undertaken in each institution to tighten up control in those areas. The information I had was that, in respect of this particular institution, control was virtually non-existent. Consequently, I said that I was not satisfied with what I was being told and that I would have a Public Service investigation. I arranged with the Chairman of the Public Service Board for a committee to be set up, after consulting the Minister of Health. In the course of the investigation by the Corbett Committee, certain information came to it. I do not propose to outline that, because it became the subject of a police inquiry, which has not been completed. In consequence of those factors, the police were asked to investigate certain matters, and they are continuing to do so. That is the situation.

ST. KILDA FISHING

Mr. GROTH: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Fisheries what action has been taken following the recent seizure of a considerable length of fishing net at St. Kilda? Late last week I was informed by constituents that fisheries inspectors had found a long length of net set in the prohibited area adjacent to St. Kilda. The net was set without any buoys on it or without any tags by which the owner could be identified. There were no tags showing his name or registration number. Has the Minister any information?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member mentioned this matter to me, and I made some inquiries of the Minister of Fisheries just before coming into the House. He told me that about 800 metres of net, I think, was confiscated in an aquatic reserve at St. Kilda. Evidently, this is a trouble spot. Night patrols are being made by fisheries inspectors at that spot and also at another trouble spot at North Haven. Attempts so far to identify the owner or owners of this net have not succeeded, but inquiries are continuing.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the member for Florey, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, say whether that committee has reached the stage of preparing a draft report on its hospitals' investigation, or is information still coming to hand that makes the preparation of a report impracticable now?

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Florey whether he wishes to reply. I can assure honourable members that I listened to that question, as I will to others, but, if this practice becomes rife in the House, questions to private members may well be stopped. Does the honourable member intend to reply?

Mr. WELLS: I will reply, Mr. Speaker. The situation is

that a draft report was being formulated: it was not completed. The report was nearing completion but, because of the defection of two of the members from the other side of this House from the committee, it was necessary for those members to be replaced by two other members, both of whom are performing a particularly diligent and useful job for the committee at this stage.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: If you don't want to hear it, just tell me and I will sit down. The position is that a report was nearing completion, and I informed the new members of the committee that I would be required to sign the report. As they were new members and had progressed along the line for two or three meetings, I advised them that, when I signed the report, they were a party to the contents of the report. They both objected—

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: Of course, you were one of the principal factors, so you should hide your head in shame.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey knows that when the Speaker stands he must resume his seat.

Mr. WELLS: I am sorry, I didn't see you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member will, when addressing members opposite, say "honourable members" and not "you". I want all members to do that. I hope that there will be no more interjections.

Mr. WELLS: As a consequence of being told that they would be a party to that report, they objected strenuously and stated that they wanted a reappraisal of the whole matter on which the committee had been engaged. That has caused a major delay. That is what has been occurring for the recent sessions of the committee. Those inquiries and further study of the previous evidence will continue. In no circumstances will the committee be bulldozed, bullied, or coerced into producing a report prematurely. When a report is complete, it will be delivered and presented to this House as the law requires. Until then there will be no report and there will most certainly be no undue haste in producing a report on a matter of such great importance.

SCHOOL VANDALISM

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Education say whether any arrangements have been made to provide for security in schools in an attempt to combat acts of vandalism and break-ins that might otherwise occur? During the past few weeks vandalism has taken place at three schools in my district. Although the schools were broken into and windows were broken, little was stolen, and valuable electronic equipment, which was readily available for people to steal, was left in place. One act of vandalism occurred a fortnight ago when a school council meeting was in progress. Kerosene was poured on the steps of the building but, fortunately, it was noticed before it could be set alight.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not think there is any final solution to the problem of vandalism in schools—that has been a serious problem for a few years. This is in part related to the high level of youth unemployment with bored young people hanging around the streets with not enough to do to occupy their time.

The Education Department employs a security officer whose job it is not to attend personally to the security problem of every school in the State (that obviously would be an impossible task), but to advise the department on appropriate measures that might be taken in schools. For

example, as a result of the advice of that gentleman one particular school has been floodlit extensively on an experimental basis, and that has had some success. We really do not want to floodlight every school in the State as a means of forestalling vandalism, but that school had had a high incidence of vandalism and it was thought that, if this could be done on a trial basis, it could point to what could be done in other schools in the metropolitan area with a similar high incidence of vandalism.

In a series of schools the Police Force is undertaking regular patrols. Advice is being received from the Police Department, but I have no desire to divulge which schools are involved. By and large, although vandalism continues in schools, it has abated somewhat during this year compared to what we saw in the past few years. No doubt that is due, in part, to increased vigilance by schools and, in part, due to an education programme that is being undertaken in the schools. The House will also be aware that the Government has a committee, which is chaired by an officer of my department, examining this problem. I will take up the specific matters of the schools to which the honourable member has referred and get further information for him. That is a general summary of what the department is doing to mitigate what is accepted as being a difficult problem.

FUEL TANKERS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister, representing the Minister of Transport, say whether the Government is satisfied that the law relating to the carriage of highly flammable fuels and gases on public roads in South Australia is adequate and, if it is not, what action does the Government intend to take to change the law to protect public life and property in the event of an accident in this State? Following recent highway accidents in other parts of the world—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have a similar question on the Notice Paper. I refer to question 208 in my name.

The SPEAKER: I should like the member for Mitcham to allow the member for Alexandra to explain his question.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling. I asked specifically what action the Government proposed to take with respect to changing the law, and not as related to the inspectorial duties of the department, as incorporated in the Question on Notice—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a further point of order, Mr. Speaker. I refer to part four of the question, which is precisely what the member for Alexandra is asking.

The SPEAKER: I would like the member for Alexandra to ask his question again, so that I can follow it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Question 208 deals only with liquid petroleum gas. If the honourable member for Alexandra's question dealt with flammable fuels, other than L.P.G., I suggest that it would be in order.

The SPEAKER: I would like the member for Alexandra to repeat his question.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I shall try, as near as I can, to repeat the question. I do not need any further opportunity to explain: the question was clear in that I was seeking to know whether the Government proposed to change the law in relation to the carriage of highly flammable fuels on the public roadways within South Australia. If so, what action the Government was going to take in order to protect the property and life of residents of this State.

I did go on, before the interjection by the member for

Mitcham, to explain briefly that there have been a series of recent serious accidents in places overseas as a result of vehicles carrying highly flammable fuels or gases. All I am really interested in is whether the Government is satisfied that the people of South Australia are protected and whether, if the Government believes that the present law does not protect people, it will make every effort to do so forthwith.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain a report from the Transport Department. I am sure that that department consults fully with the Labour and Industry Department, which I am sure is also involved with this matter.

WATER FILTRATION

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Works inform me when the suburbs to the south of Adelaide will benefit from the Government's filtered water programme, which has been deferred because of the Fraser Government's lack of funding? I believe that the Hayden Budget of 1975 provided for sums to speed up this programme. With the installation of the so-called Fraser caretaker Government that money was savagely cut back. I am wondering when people in my district will be able to benefit from what we consider to be a normal standard of living.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Because of reasons, which were given in part by the honourable member, there will be a delay in supplying filtered water to the southern suburbs. The honourable member would be aware that it is planned to build seven water filtration plants to totally filter the water supplied to the citizens of metropolitan Adelaide. Also, he would be aware, as he has mentioned, that there was an undertaking given by the Whitlam Government that it would fund this programme up to \$100 000 000 for a 10-year period on the basis of a 70 per cent long-term loan and a 30 per cent grant.

That undertaking has been broken by the Fraser Government, and the State will receive only about \$4 500 000 from the Federal Government this year and will be required to make up the difference in order to maintain the programme at an economic level. We will not be maintaining the programme at the rate we would like to be, because we had proposed, initially, to have the whole of the metropolitan area receiving filtered water within 10 years. I can only forecast, at this stage, that it will probably be nearer 15 years before constituents of the honourable member will be able to enjoy, not the luxury but the facility, of filtered water. It is no luxury, and honourable members would know that the inquiry conducted into the supply of water to Adelaide by the then Snowy Mountains Authority resulted in a report that stated it was absolutely necessary that water supplied to Adelaide's citizens be filtered.

It is a great disappointment to the South Australian Government that the Fraser Government has broken the undertaking given by the former Whitlam Government and has reduced the funds for this important and costly programme to the extent that it has done.

Mr. Evans: Are you going to cut the price for those—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will let the honourable member pay for that. He thinks it is funny, and that is one of the problems, which have been exacerbated by the niggardly attitude of the Federal Government. He knows it, and he is gloating over it. He does not care whether or not the citizens of Adelaide get filtered water, but I know his views on filtered water. He would have them drinking mud, rather than paying to filter the supply, and his attitude is as niggardly as that of his colleagues in the Federal Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Eyre to order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know the honourable member's attitude towards filtration. The South Australian Government is disappointed that this has happened. It will press on with the programme as quickly as it possibly can, although it is inevitable that the programme will take much longer than was first anticipated.

CORBETT INQUIRY

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Premier say what terms of reference were laid down for the Corbett Committee and why it was decided to include country gaols in the scope of this inquiry?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The terms of reference are referred to in the report.

Mr. Tonkin: Not very clearly; not in as many words.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Country gaols were included because they are institutions in which a similar question of food supply arises and, in consequence, the committee itself felt it proper to investigate those institutions.

Mr. WILSON: Can the Premier say when stock cards were removed from Government institution stores, as reported in the Corbett Report, and why this decision was taken, in the light of the statements critical of the Hospitals Department's budgetary control made by the Auditor-General in several succeeding annual reports?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was a debate about the usefulness of stock cards and the fact that it is difficult to operate them effectively. I will ascertain the date for the honourable member.

PHARMACEUTICAL COSTS

Mr. KLUNDER: Can the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, give any indication of the way in which prices of pharmaceutical goods increase when such goods are imported into Australia? This matter came to my attention when a constituent was able to show me that a particular pharmaceutical product of British manufacture that sells in the United Kingdom for 39 pence sells in local pharmacies here for more than \$4, or an increase of about 500 per cent.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and obtain a report.

BREATHALYSERS

Mr. OLSON: Is the Chief Secretary satisfied that the readings of breathalyser tests are accurate? I draw his attention to an article published in the *Advertiser* of 15 July 1978, where Mr. Hodgman, a Tasmanian member of Parliament, is quoted as saying that independent scientific tests had established that the breathalyser could over-read by as much as .027 per cent. Would the Minister agree with the opinion that the machine is being used in Australia for purposes for which it was never intended, and that hundreds, if not thousands, have suffered a violation of their civil liberties by having a conviction recorded against them?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I would be surprised if the allegations made were true, because breathalysers have been used widely in many States for some considerable

time. I am quite sure that people such as the member for Mitcham would have exploited any possibility of their being inaccurate before this time. The over-reading was said to be as much as .027 per cent. The standard in Tasmania is .05 per cent, and in South Australia it is .08 per cent. Even if the maximum error obtained in South Australia, the net result would be above that considered appropriate in Tasmania and in other places. That does not make it legal, but even if it were as bad as that it would mean that a reading of .08 per cent in South Australia would be at least as high as that considered in many other parts of the world to be too high. I shall have inquiries made into the matter so that the honourable member's mind can be put at rest.

SCHOOL STAFFING

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Education heard the comments made publicly today by Mr. Gregory regarding a continuation of the moratorium on the appointment of staff? Mr. Gregory has commented today that the moratorium, which originally was to have been for a two-week period, has been extended indefinitely. Concurrently with this information, the Principal of a primary school in my area has indicated that he has been refused the opportunity to replace a teachers aide who has been off work and who will continue to be off work because of major surgery, and has been refused an opportunity to replace a permanent teacher who has resigned because her husband is leaving the district in the course of re-employment. On the basis of this general background, I seek from the Minister information on whether the general moratorium is being used to reduce school staff numbers rather than for the original intention, which I believe was to prevent an escalation of school staff numbers.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: One would imagine, from all we have heard from Opposition members in the last few months, that if that was our intention they would be applauding what we are doing. I have not seen Mr. Gregory's statement of today, although he told me yesterday that he would be making a statement on this matter, and I think I can fairly accurately guess its content. The Government is taking stock of its total staffing position, and teachers are part of that scene, although they are not public servants. All we ask of people in Government employment generally is that they have some patience whilst we look at the total situation which has been forced upon us. It is not of our making. It is something we have had to do as a result of the recent disastrous Premiers' Conference and Loan Council.

Some appointments are being made, but they have got to be made in the way outlined in the circular that went around to schools a couple of weeks ago. The conditions being placed on schools in this brief interim period are no more stringent than those that apply to Government employment generally and the Public Service in particular. Once we have a clear idea of exactly where we are as a department in relation to the State Budget, other conditions will apply.

There is no intention on the part of the department to reduce the teaching force in any way. We are under a requirement, which I fully support, that there should be a short-term freeze until we are in a position to know exactly where we stand so far as the State Budget is concerned. I regret that it is necessary to take these steps. I trust that the honourable member regrets that the State has been forced into this situation in relation to all its instrumentalities, as well as schools, and I hope to be in a position to indicate before long to Mr. Gregory that the

new conditions apply. All I ask of schools is a little patience while the Government goes through this rather painful process which, as I have indicated and as I am sure everyone in the House realises, is not of the Government's making.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Mr. HEMMINGS: In view of the concern being shown by many people over reports that the Federal Government will abolish family allowances for the first child, will the Premier seek an assurance from the Prime Minister that there will be no reduction in family allowance expenditure in any way when the Federal Budget is brought down? During the past two days I, along with the member for Elizabeth and the Federal member for Bonython, have received a total of 19 telephone calls from constituents who are worried that their family allowance will be cut in the Budget. I draw attention to a report in today's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Fraser to cut child allowance", as follows:

The Federal Government would abolish family allowances for the first child, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, Senator Wriedt, said yesterday. Such a decision would mean that the payment of a \$3.50-a-week allowance to an estimated 2 000 000 Australian families would end. Senator Wriedt said the decision would take from mothers more than \$200 000 000 this year and almost \$300 000 000 in a full year. He also claimed serious consideration was being given to phasing out the scheme for families with incomes above \$150 a week. He said the Cabinet information had been leaked to him "in an attempt to force the Fraser Government to reverse this unreasonable decision".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I appreciate the honourable member's concern, I will write to the Prime Minister as he asks.

SCARLET ALLIANCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Premier and, as it has not been vetted by the Hon. Ross Story, it does not follow the—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was just putting the Premier's mind at rest: it is not about the Hospitals Department.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question is: are the women's adviser to the Government, Deborah McCulloch, and members of her staff in the Premier's Department active in the formation of a group called the Scarlet Alliance?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that the Scarlet Alliance is the name given to a proposed union of prostitutes in this State.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You'd be their patron, wouldn't you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I won't be their best customer, as the Minister might be.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One insult is as good as another, isn't it?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will ask his question.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will include the Minister for Planning if he likes.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will stick to his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member of the Premier's staff who has been mentioned particularly to me by name is one Andy Sebastian who, I think, is in that unit. I believe that the answer to the question is "Yes" but, in confirmation of that, I tell the Premier, if he is not already aware of it, that there was a seminar on women's matters about three weeks ago that I—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Attended.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Indeed, yes; I spoke, and was then bitterly attacked by Deborah McCulloch. I don't know whether to call her "Mrs.", "Miss", or "Ms.", but I was accused of being sexist, racist, bigoted and everything else.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The next day this lady chaired what was called I think a workshop group which discussed the question of the formation of a union of prostitutes (I have this from a member of the group), and the decision to do so was passed by 18 votes to five in their group. The lady voted, I am reliably told, in favour of it. A report in the *Sunday Mail* of last week featured a photograph of her and showed that she was in favour of the union. It has again been reported to me today that these ladies in the Premier's Department, Miss McCulloch, and this woman Sebastian and others, are the moving forces behind the formation of this union. In view of the Premier's announcement yesterday and the general controversy over this matter, I put the question to the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Miss McCulloch certainly chaired the working session of a seminar which was addressed by the honourable member, also I understand by the member for Coles and various other people in South Australia, a seminar on particular areas of concern to women within the State.

Mr. Millhouse: This was a workshop on prostitution.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was part of the total seminar. A decision was taken by a group attending that particular workshop that an association of people involved in prostitution should be formed because there is the question of their making representations concerning the law in South Australia and the law as it affects them. I understand that the honourable member delivered himself of quite a lengthy diatribe as to the character of these people, as a result of which I can assure the House that they do not regard the honourable member as their patron but characterise him in quite another fashion.

Mr. Millhouse: She made that quite clear.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I have no doubt that she would.

Mr. Millhouse: Almost as eloquently as you would have done.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate having staff who are clearly spoken.

Mr. Millhouse: You may have been coaching her.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member is being sexist again I assure him it is quite unnecessary. In consequence of the decisions taken by the women concerned, I understand that they have proceeded to form an association possibly with the name that the honourable member ascribed to them, but to say that Miss McCulloch, or a member of her staff, is the moving spirit in this is quite incorrect. I had a report about it from Miss McCulloch yesterday in which she completely denies that that is the case.

Mr. Millhouse: Did you accept her denial?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course I accepted her denial. She pointed out to me that in fact she had been misrepresented publicly about the things she had said on the matter. She is not a moving spirit in this, but it is necessary for her as adviser to me on women's matters to be in touch with various groups of women. She is in touch with a wide variety of groups of women, not all of whom she agrees with by any means.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the other girl?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will have to call the member for Mitcham to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am informed that that situation is the case with all the staff of the women's advisory section.

RECREATION PARK

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister for Planning provide me with a detailed up-to-date report on the stage reached and future planning in the project to transform a quarry site adjacent to North-East Road and Perseverance Road, Tea Tree Gully, into a sports and recreation park on land acquired by the State Planning Authority as part of the planned 345 hectare Anstey Hill regional park, and any other relevant information available in respect to the other section of the park?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get a detailed report for the honourable member. From memory, there are a few years to go before the quarry is worked out and before detailed work on the development of that particular area for park purposes can take place.

MURRAY VALLEY DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government will seriously consider the need to increase the South Australian financial contribution to the Murray Valley Development League as a matter of urgency? On 8 June, I attended in Swan Hill the annual general meeting of the Murray Valley Development League. I was alarmed to learn that the operations of that organisation for the financial year had resulted in a considerable accumulated loss. It is generally considered that the Murray Valley Development League is the one organisation operating in the three States which has particular concern for the people living in the Murray Valley, whether they be in Victoria, New South Wales or South Australia, and that it is doing much to break down the parochialism existing between the three States. Since this parochialism particularly affects South Australia, I believe that we have much to benefit from this organisation. In the year ended 31 March 1978 the Australian Government contributed \$5 000 to the league, the Victorian Government \$5 000, the South Australian Government \$5 000 and the New South Wales Government \$3 000. At the moment there is no indication that the Federal Government will contribute anything this financial year, although I hope that it will change its attitude to this matter. However, as I have said, it is largely considered that South Australia has much to gain from this organisation, and I would appreciate the Minister seriously considering increasing the contributions made to this organisation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's concern about this matter and his frankness in divulging to this House that it does not look as though the Federal Government will provide the grant of

\$5 000 this year in line with past practice. I guess we can say that this is just another example of the way the Federal Government is being niggardly in its attitude to matters of importance to this State. I agree that the Murray Valley Development League is important to this State for the reasons given by the honourable member. I am not aware of any approach that has been made by the league to the South Australian Government, but I assure the honourable member that I will certainly give sympathetic consideration to the points he has made or to any approach that I receive from the league. However, I point out that it is not possible for this State to go on making up the shortfall that the Federal Government brings about in so many areas, this being only a small area in comparison. Bearing that in mind, I shall be happy to have a look at the matter when it comes forward.

VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Mr. BECKER: My question to the Minister of Labour and Industry is supplementary to the question asked by the member for Kavel on Tuesday 18 July concerning voluntary workers. Will the Minister urgently reconsider his decision not to intervene in the case before the State Industrial Commission of *St. John Employees (AGWA) v. St. John Council*?

On Tuesday in reply to the member for Kavel, the Minister said, amongst other things, that the Government was not in a position to interfere in any case of this nature before the court. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, section 44, paragraph 1, provides:

The Minister may, where in his opinion the public interest is or would be likely to be effected by the award order decision or determination of the court or commission, intervene in any proceedings before the court or commission and make such representations and tender such evidence as he thinks necessary.

I think all members realise that I have been involved in voluntary work for the past two years, and everyone knows how difficult it is to obtain volunteers and to fund such organisations. I would appreciate the Minister's considering this matter again as a matter of urgency.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I made the Government's position clear, I think, on Tuesday. That is, there is no need to intervene in this case. If there is public interest, and the Government watches that closely, then naturally the Government has the right to intervene. I did not say I did not have the right to intervene: I do not think, on these grounds, there is a moral right to interfere.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You might offend the union.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will get to you in a moment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister should say "honourable member".

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The question by the member for Hanson has no new material in it, therefore I do not intend to belabour the matter at length. I rely on what I have said earlier. It seems to me that this is the third time in three days that there has been (in my opinion) a complete vote of no confidence by the Liberal Party in the Industrial Court of South Australia. It means that Opposition members are not prepared to let the court make its determination.

Mr. Tonkin: You're not discharging your duties to the court by bringing all relevant information before it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Leader to order. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The application now before the court was not made by the union, but was made by St. John Ambulance Brigade. The Government has made its

position clear; it supports the right of voluntary workers to work, it stands by that position. I have confidence in the court to determine the matter in its own way, and I will not interfere in that case.

DRUG GAME

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Premier, in the absence of the Attorney-General, say whether the Government intends to take action to restrict or prevent the sale of a new monopoly-type game called "Freak Out"? On the front page of the *Advertiser* of Thursday last a report entitled, "Dope now a Dicey Game" gave prominence to a new game obviously designed around the drug scene. Some of my constituents are concerned by the reference which states, "Pay \$500 to Drug Squad to Prevent Bust". My constituents believe that the implication in that reference is that the drug scene obviously believes that the Drug Squad can be bribed to prevent apprehension. Such a suggestion is obviously a reflection on any law enforcement authority.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer this matter to my colleague.

CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment say from what sources the Wildlife Conservation Fund was raised before the disbandment of the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council? Also, can the Minister say whether any of this fund has been spent since the termination of this council and, as a result of that termination, can he say who will now be directly responsible for the management of the fund, and what role the Minister will play in the spending of such a fund.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member would know, the source of the fund is from fees. The money derived goes into this fund, and can be used both for conservation and for the development of game reserves and such things. The honourable member is correct in saying that the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council, before my announcement that it would not continue, was responsible for advising me how the fund would be spent. That responsibility will be taken over by the small committee that I said will be appointed, and part of its responsibility will be to advise me where and how this fund should be spent. I will play exactly the same role in future as I have played in the past.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSIONER

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the replacement for Commissioner Portus in the Industrial Court will be a resident of South Australia? Commissioner Portus was a local person who made himself available readily on occasions when he was required. I believe that his replacement should reside in South Australia, and be available immediately to further the procedures that will be necessary for him to consider in court.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have been concerned about this matter, because when I heard that Commissioner Portus was retiring I felt sad. He has been a competent Commissioner and has upheld the arbitration system successfully in South Australia. He has been living in South Australia for 20 or more years and, as a consequence of his position, has been on tap almost

immediately for any Federal industrial dispute. On hearing of the retirement, I immediately rang Mr. Street in Canberra and asked him his intentions in this matter. He said he was having some difficulty, that he would get back to me, and would I send him a letter.

I wrote to Mr. Street setting out in detail the reasons I thought it necessary to have at least one Federal Commissioner based in South Australia. I have received a reply from Mr. Street stating that the Federal President, Sir John Moore, was not agreeable to dispersing his commissioners around Australia, although I mentioned that Mr. Commissioner Coleman is based in Western Australia. I have asked the Trades and Labor Council to protest to the Federal Minister about this matter, because I believe industrial disputes can be nipped in the bud if a commissioner, or someone competent to deal with the matter, is available when it is placed before the Commission.

I am not sure whether a new commissioner has been appointed, but it is evident that he will not be residing in South Australia. That means that there could be up to a week's delay before a matter comes before a commissioner. Under the present administration arrangements, it is not possible for a State commissioner to be called in on a Federal industrial dispute.

I urge Opposition members, if they think they can provide any assistance in this matter, to complain to the Federal Minister and ask him to reconsider his decision. I am not asking for a South Australian to be appointed, but that the successful candidate will reside in South Australia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FILTERED WATER

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. EVANS: When the Minister of Works was replying to a question asked by the member for Mawson, I interjected and asked the Minister whether he would consider reducing the unit cost of water for those people who did not have filtered water delivered to their properties. The Minister alleged at the time that I was gloating over the position that people in some areas were drinking half mud in their water supply, and that I was glad about that.

My concern was that the Government is charging full tote odds for half mud supplied to those who do not have filtered water. Because they are getting half mud, I thought that they should be considered for a reduction in the unit cost of water, because neither the Federal Government nor State Government has had to install filters. I thought that the Government was overcharging those people and that it was a rip-off and that, because it was a rip-off, the Government should not be charging top rates for second-quality water, which the Minister admitted they received.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 14, line 46 (clause 19)—Leave out "two years" and insert "one year".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

The Legislative Council has proposed to change the limitation of time for the bringing of prosecutions under this Act from two years to one year. That means that, unless a prosecution is launched within one year of the date of the offence, it is out of time and cannot be brought. That is an unreasonable restriction, and it is not in line with other legislation of this kind presently. The Land Tax Act provides for a three-year limitation, the Builders Licensing Act for a two-year limitation, and the Land and Business Agents Act also for a two-year limitation, but there is an additional factor in this case.

The franchise Acts, in raising revenue, relate to revenue raised for a turnover in a previous period to the licensing period, and, in consequence, there has to be time for the accounting to take place, because the licensing period has to be removed in time from the period in respect of which the turnover is calculated. In consequence, there is even more difficulty in a time limitation in respect of a taxation measure of this kind than in the other measures to which I have referred, where the standard period is two years or more. In consequence, for the Legislative Council to require a reduction in the time limit of this kind is unreasonable, and I do not believe that we should accept it.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I take the Premier's explanation on this matter as far as it goes, but I cannot understand it, having looked at the Hon. K. T. Griffin's explanation of proceedings in another place. He makes the point that, with the cutting back of the duration of the licence from 12 months to one month, so that there is only a one-month licence, some merchants may not know where they stand if the period continues to be two years as set down. No time is set down in the present Act. I understand that the normal period is six months for complaints to be issued.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's under the Police Offences Act, but not in respect of taxation measures. In all the taxation measures it is longer.

Mr. TONKIN: I shall be pleased to listen to the Premier explain that more fully. It seems to me that 12 months is reasonable in the circumstances that have been outlined.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because this is a taxation measure it requires returns over a period; it requires accounts to be made up in respect of a turnover period that is removed from the actual licensing period in a period of time. It is obviously not a case where you can apply the normal provisions of the Police Offences Act for simple offences. The provision in the Bill is exactly similar to the provision in the New South Wales Tobacco Franchise Act; it is similar to the provision in the Builders Licensing Act and in the Land and Business Agents Act, and it is less than the period in the Land Tax Act. In those circumstances, I believe that the Legislative Council has proposed an unreasonable limitation on the prosecution time.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment will prevent the appropriate criminal sanctions being imposed in certain cases.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 19 July. Page 113.)

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Yesterday, when I sought leave to continue my remarks, I was referring to

the fact that colleges of advanced education might need to diversify their different educational functions in view of the fact that we will have a considerable surplus of teachers up to 1985 (about 3 500 is the projected figure). That is a fairly obvious situation. Really, the action that has to be taken will involve, I consider, quite a different approach to education, not simply at the college of advanced education level, but from pre-school onwards. I would, before enlarging on that remark, make one point. Earlier, during Question Time, the Minister referred to the possibility of there being cut-backs in staffing in the educational field. Once again, I refer to the advice recently received from Senator John Carrick, the Federal Minister for Education, that the sum being provided by the Federal Government would in the primary and secondary education field be held at a constant level and that the expression "constant dollars" referred to the fact that the cost would contain an inflationary factor.

Senator Carrick referred to the fact that the State Government provides 80 per cent of funding and that the Federal Government has always regarded its contribution as a topping-up operation of about 20 per cent; therefore, the State Government's 80 per cent contribution, plus the sum allowed to South Australia under federalism funding, mean that the South Australian Minister of Education will allocate his own priorities, provided he can get them through Cabinet. The ratio of responsibility is one of more than four to one in favour of the State Minister of Education should there be any decision at all either to increase or to cut back on staffing in the Government schools area.

The figures speak for themselves. That aside, I will make one admission. Recently, I have approached the Federal Minister responsible for pre-school funding with a request that some consideration be given to maintaining the Federal level of expenditure on pre-school education. I think the House should bear in mind, however, that over several previous years a greater amount of money was made available for pre-school education than was used. I know that financial years and calendar years have tended to confuse the issue, but money which was allocated at Federal level was allowed to carry over into the following financial year. It was not terminated and made a specific amount for spending in a specific year.

The fact remains, however, that I personally would like to see some maintenance of funding, from both State and Federal Governments, for the pre-school area, and for one very specific reason: I do not look at pre-school as a form of baby-sitting, as so many people do. I regard it as an essential part of a child's education, and I regard it as extremely critical that pre-school needs be met in under-privileged areas, where there is a socio-economic deficiency.

In better-class homes, for want of a better expression—and I know that that smacks of some form of snobbery—where parents can afford to give children, from birth, a wide range of experiences, including a great number of books and parental conversation and interest, the youngsters undoubtedly have an advantage. In homes where there is a lower socio-economic background and where, for a wide variety of reasons, there is not the opportunity for youngsters to get that pre-school knowledge which is so essential to their later development, whether it involves ethnic groups (and I include our own Aboriginal society as the earliest of ethnic groups, following the white take-over), whether it is in lower socio-economic areas (Port Adelaide, for example, because that is certainly an area that has shown a need), or wherever the area, we should be looking to helping that class of person and that class of child. It is an attempt to

bring children up to a certain standard before they commence primary school.

This brings me to another major argument. The Australian Teachers Federation and Ministers in Governments across Australia have for decades, not just recently, seen fit to encourage the secondary education area at the expense of the primary education area. I draw attention in particular to one extremely important Federal Government report. It was Parliamentary Paper No. 241 of 1976, involving the House of Representatives Select Committee on Specific Learning Difficulties. Included in that report, which may have seemed to have rather a narrow field of influence, on page 42 was one of the most important statements made on education for many a long year. It is lost amidst 153 pages of information, but that single sentence states:

One of the most urgent needs in education is for a totally new assessment of the paramount significance of primary education.

For years, primary schools have been the poor relation. It is only recently that staffing has achieved some equality in terms of status with secondary school teachers. It has been the practice for years in schools everywhere for new teachers out of college to cut their teeth on students newly entering school—the very worst type of education situation for both groups. A recent research project undertaken by Canada's McGill University has shown that, over a lengthy period, children who entered primary school and who enjoyed the teaching of expert and dedicated teachers were better off sociologically and economically in 10 or 20 years time than were children who entered school and were given, right from the outset, less than excellent teaching.

I regard the two statements—the one from the Specific Learning Difficulties Committee and the other from the McGill University—as reinforcing one another. What should we be doing? We should be examining, first of all, the role played by colleges of advanced education, teacher-training institutions, over the years and whether they have been turning out a product which, right from the outset, could tackle basic learning problems. I do not see specific learning difficulties as being a narrow field. I am quite sure that every teacher, in primary and secondary schools and through to universities, will recognise that there are students at all levels who are behind the norm. Here again, there is the question of standards being tested and worked to.

In every class in every school there will be youngsters performing in numbers or letters, numeracy or literacy, behind the norm, behind the State or national average.

The question is, therefore, whether all teachers who emerge from college should be given basic training, before they leave, in diagnostic and attainment work and in remedial work, so that they can single out the students in need of remedial work, treating them not as children with specific learning difficulties and trying to pass them off to someone else in a different class away from their peer groups, but as part and parcel of the normal process of education.

This will demand a different ratio of teacher-student staffing in primary schools from that obtaining at present. It would probably have been better for Australia's youth had a smaller teacher-student ratio obtained in primary schools over the decades rather than in secondary schools. There is no doubt that teachers, diagnosing and then trying to remedy problems in primary schools, will keep children closer in educational attainment to the standards of their peer group. It is a sin, really, that somewhere around 20 per cent of students can leave primary school, because of this wrong teacher-student staffing ratio, and

enter secondary school with a below-average attainment in either or both of literacy and numeracy.

This is not a figure plucked out of the air. The work of Bourke and Keeves, of the Australian Council for Educational Research—and there is a discussion at the Institute of Teachers in Adelaide this evening on this topic—and of others across the Western world has demonstrated that too high a proportion of children enter secondary school struggling, and there is no question that colleges have taught teachers how to teach subjects, but not necessarily how to teach children and to diagnose their faults. Every teacher should be able to diagnose the basic faults and to take some steps towards remedying them. For example, it should not be left to the English teacher to correct English faults or to the mathematics teacher to correct number faults: they should be spotted and corrected wherever and whenever they are found, irrespective of which teacher is teaching. However, that has not applied over the years.

The mathematics teachers associations and the English teachers associations over the past two years have reinforced what I am saying, so my ideas are not diametrically opposed to what they are already putting forward. Professional teachers have known these things for many years but there has been no Ministerial or departmental philosophy to isolate the problem, to tackle it where it should be tackled at pre-school and primary school level, and to allow secondary school teachers to get on with the job of developing a child towards employment. Too many secondary school teachers have had the problem of remedying faults from primary school without being able to train that student for his job in life. Let us face it, most of us, whether we are girls or boys, must work at some time in life. We have gone backwards because, at secondary level, we threw out several years ago the very standard score tests that used to be part and parcel of promotion from primary school to secondary school. It was not necessary to pass a standard score test in order to be promoted; one went up with one's peer groups.

Mr. Klunder: You could be 17 and still in primary school.

Mr. ALLISON: That is definitely wrong, and I will not accept that interjection.

Mr. Groom: Did you go to primary school?

Mr. ALLISON: I had only four years at primary school before I went to grammar school, would you believe.

Mr. Groom: We believe it.

Mr. ALLISON: I knew you would—genius finds its own level—but I am talking about the rest of you. You have my sympathy. Be that as it may, the standard score tests, which used to be part and parcel of educational testing that professional teachers seized upon (not with glee so that they could punish a child with them but with great interest so that they could use the standard score to diagnose exactly what remedial treatment a child needed) went by the board. As a result, the whole of Australia in the teaching profession has a certain number of people who say, "What need exists for standards?" and "What standards would you aspire to?" They laugh and mock standards and examinations as though it were a sin even to think about them, let alone put them into practice.

The point is that at any stage standards could be attained and tested across the length and breadth of Australia to help the child and not hinder him. Unless one has some sort of standard to work to, unless this Government has a policy towards which it will aspire, and has standards to work towards, and unless the Opposition has standards to work towards, people would question our motives in being here. Education can certainly do no less than have some form of accountability and work towards

some form of standard.

I believe, in casting out standard scores and national attainment tests and not working towards some form of assessment, we have done students, parents and the education profession itself a great disservice. I have much more to say on this continuing progress towards university and/or work at other levels but time will prevent me from enlarging on it now. Be that as it may, the primary education field must be tackled first.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I support the motion. Yesterday, this House was subjected to a speech by the Leader of the Opposition that was no more than a farrago of political and economic misconceptions. That the Leader should promote such garbage is bad enough, but that he obviously believed what he was saying makes him an extremely dangerous man. He is, after all, the Leader of what the Opposition fondly describes itself as the alternative Government for South Australia. His attacks on the Premier are scandalous in the extreme; they are a new low from a person whose statements in this House have no regard for the truth whatever. On this occasion the Leader's actions are despicable. What evidence does he have, apart from a warped, paranoid and frustrated personality, to substantiate his charges? Is he prepared to quote one instance—

Mr. Tonkin: Is that a challenge? You're not even prepared to let me interject, are you?

Mr. KENEALLY: If the Leader would let me make my speech, he will get his opportunity.

Mr. Gunn: Are you going to read—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Eyre to order.

Mr. KENEALLY: Thank you for protecting me, Sir.

The SPEAKER: On many occasions yesterday I think that members read their speeches.

Mr. KENEALLY: I have copious notes. Is the Leader prepared to quote one instance where a company has been threatened or blackmailed into financially supporting the Government? Can he provide one such instance? Of course he cannot. He has not one shred of evidence. If he did have, he would be prepared to produce it here. This is a classic example of using the privileges of this Parliament, the coward's castle, to mount a vicious personal attack on the Premier. The Leader wishes, of course, to destroy that gentleman's credibility, and that he has been prompted to do by the successful (and I say that sadly) attacks upon some of our Federal Labor colleagues during the past three or four years. The Leader would not be prepared to make such statements outside the House. I cannot believe, anyhow, that his performance would be anything but counter-productive. I think it was the Leader himself who was reported in the *Advertiser* on 17 May 1978 as saying:

There is no way that rumours which attack the Premier or the Government are in fact going to destroy it because 99 per cent of them have no basis in fact. We have been preoccupied with rumours . . .

I ask the House who is rumour-mongering now! Obviously, it is the Leader of the Opposition. We have often heard him say that industry will not come to South Australia. He bemoans this supposed fact. It is the sort of article that is printed and contained in the speeches that the Leader makes that is the greatest disincentive of all for industry coming to South Australia. The sooner he stops knocking South Australia the better. That is a phrase that is being said continually, and it is as true today as it was two or three years ago when the Leader started on his programme of knocking.

The Leader says that South Australia is becoming a totalitarian State. He says that the conditions that apply in a totalitarian society already apply here. Perhaps the honourable gentleman has missed his calling; he has certainly lost his marbles. He ought not to be practising medicine or polluting politics: he should be writing science fiction. The notion that South Australia is a totalitarian State is completely ludicrous, except perhaps to an unusually warped intellect.

The Leader is also highly critical of the South Australian deficit of \$25 000 000. There seems to be a strange contradiction in the Opposition's attitude to deficits. Deficits are profligate and irresponsible if Labor Governments incur them, but they indicate good economic management and responsibility if Liberal Governments incur them. Contrast the attitude of members opposite as between the deficits of the Federal Labor Government during the Whitlam years and the deficits of the Fraser Government.

In two years the combined deficits of the Fraser Government are higher than the combined deficits of the Whitlam Governments in three years. However, the deficits incurred by the Labor Governments, both Federal and State, were incurred with regard to assisting that unfortunate section of our community, the unemployed. The deficits incurred in this way (to which I might say that the honourable gentleman is opposed; he is opposed to any Government that seeks to assist the unemployed) by the Federal Labor Government were incurred despite a deliberate attempt to scale down unemployment.

The classic example of the attempts by Labor Governments to improve or assist in the area of unemployment have been the RED and SURS schemes. These schemes have been opposed violently by members opposite. The slavish and sycophantic way in which Opposition members support every move of the Fraser Federal Government is not in the best interests of South Australia, which State they purport to represent.

South Australia has the highest level of services of any State in Australia, and the Federal Government's policy seeks to destroy that situation. Instead of supporting South Australia and looking after the interests of the people they represent, members opposite support the Federal Government in narrow political interests. They are more interested in point scoring than they are in the welfare of South Australia. In my eight years in this place, I cannot recall one instance where a member of the Liberal Party in South Australia has criticised his Federal colleagues in any way. I should like that to be contrasted with the disagreement that the Premier of this State had with the Whitlam Administration when it was in power. The Labor Party is concerned about the welfare of the people of this State but the Liberal Party is concerned only about narrow political advantage and point scoring.

I was interested in some of the interjections made by the Leader of the Opposition. He seems to believe any degree of suffering in South Australia is all right so long as we do not suffer to a greater degree than do people in other States. That is not acceptable at all. All States are suffering under the Federal policies of this present Government and, if honourable members opposite want to disagree with that point, they should have a word with their colleague in Victoria, Mr. Hamer.

The Liberal Party has a short memory of matters political. Cannot they recall the jibes and criticisms they levelled at the Federal Labor Party when it was in office? I have already referred to the jibes about the record deficits. They say that deficits are all right if the Liberal Party incurs them but they are objectionable if the Labor Party incurs them. We can remember the jibes about corruption

in government. I wonder how they explain the activities of Garland, Robertson, Lynch and Sinclair, and the misleading of Parliament by Withers and Fraser. I will recall the Federal Leader of the Opposition, as he was then, saying that Australia should not have a Prime Minister as a tourist and we should not have a tourist as a Prime Minister. What have we now? A man who visits Australia every now and then to have a rest.

We have a tourist all right as a Prime Minister, but here again it is all right for Liberal Prime Ministers to tour overseas but it is not all right for Labor Prime Ministers to do so. My personal view on this is well known. I believe it is not only desirable but essential for Prime Ministers and Premiers of our States to travel overseas. I will not criticise Mr. Fraser's activities in that regard, but I will remember the criticisms by members opposite of Mr. Whitlam.

I recall the criticisms made of high spending at the Lodge. There has been a spate of high spending at the Lodge in recent years. I do not have to remind members of the purchase of crockery sets and the extensions to the Lodge. Members know well that the present incumbent of the Lodge does not think that standards there are up to what he would expect. He has to improve the Lodge at great cost to the taxpayer in Australia, when he is requiring everyone else to tighten belts.

When the Labor Party wanted to borrow overseas, this was regarded as a crime. The Liberal Party has borrowed more money overseas since it has been the Federal Government than the Labor Party hoped to do. The Labor Party wanted to borrow overseas so that it could buy back resources of minerals and so that the Australian community could benefit. What benefit have we received from the borrowings of the Fraser Government? None, because the Fraser Government never borrows overseas for the benefit of the average person in this country. If it borrows overseas, it is to benefit a certain section. I am prepared to concede that the Fraser Government has had a degree of success in reducing inflation, but at what cost? It said it would retain Medibank but in what condition has it retained it? It did not tell us what it would do. That is another trick of our Prime Minister.

Mr. Groom: Another broken promise.

Mr. KENEALLY: A broken promise, you might well say, but he is an absolute master of saying one thing and meaning something else. It is to the detriment of Australia when that something else is put into effect. Mr. Fraser said that his Government would keep down taxes, but the Federal Government has not been able to do so.

What about the fiasco that is now taking place? The Prime Minister said that he would take away from taxpayers the tax deductibility allowance for children in favour of family allowances, which he said would be a great boon to the family. Now we see that the Federal Government is threatening to take away family allowances. This might be another attempt by the Fraser Government to frighten the life out of the community by threatening them with all sorts of dire consequences of the Federal Budget and then go only half-way, so that everyone will think that the Budget is only half as bad as was expected, when it is probably twice as bad as it needs to be. I can go on and on about the Fraser Government's broken promises. The promises and the performance are as far apart as the Liberal Party is from reality.

The cost of reduced inflation is a subject that members opposite have avoided, and not only in their public statements outside the House. There has not been one comment either in Question Time or during debate in this House dealing with the greatest problem this country and the capitalist world faces—unemployment. The Liberal Party ought to be condemned for that. The snide remarks

of the Deputy Leader when making claims for reducing inflation do him no credit. I will give Fraser credit for the greatest shift of the gross national product from wages and salaries to company profits and dividends. There is no doubt he has been able to achieve that. He obviously serves well that section of the community that supports him financially and in other ways.

I believe unemployment is such a serious problem it should not be made the subject of point scoring by members. In reply to a question today the Minister of Labour and Industry made that point. I am not saying that the blame for unemployment lies with one political Party or the other. I believe that neither the Whitlam Administration nor the Fraser Administration was responsible for high unemployment in Australia. Certainly the decisions of the Whitlam Government and the decisions of the Fraser Government bear to some degree upon the extent of unemployment, whether for good or for bad, but they are not the root cause of it. The problem is more complex. I sincerely believe it has to do with the slow but certain breakdown of the capitalist system, and Australia along with other capitalist societies cannot expect to be immune from the consequences of this breakdown.

Having refused to lay the blame for unemployment at the door of any one political Party, I comment on the attitude of Parties to this problem. The Fraser Government quite definitely and callously is following a policy of increased unemployment as a counter to inflation. The long-term effects of this madness will be referred to later.

In the short term, however, Liberal and National Country Party members of Parliament, both Federal and State, can live with this policy because they do not represent districts in which high unemployment exists, as that exists mainly in industrial areas represented by Australian Labor Party members. I do not think Opposition members or their Federal colleagues would recognise a worker if they saw one: they certainly would not recognise an unemployed worker. Despite that, they have a unique ability to recognise a "dole bludger".

I said earlier that there has been no comment during this Parliamentary session, which has not been proceeding for a long period I admit, on the one greatest single problem the country faces—unemployment. I know that Opposition members would like to see full employment return to this country. I know that individual members opposite are not delighted because we have this high unemployment. However, I ask them to stop this narrow political activity and join with the Government and all reasonable and responsible people in the community in asking that some action be taken to reduce unemployment.

I think it is a salutary lesson to the Opposition, and a heartening experience to members on this side, to see editorials in newspapers that have not traditionally supported the Government in this State now stating that it is about time we stopped hiding from unemployment. Ignoring its existence will not make it go away.

My final point refers to statistics supporting my argument that no single Party is responsible for unemployment, but that some decisions and policies do bear heavily on it. From the time that the Whitlam Government took office until 1975 there was an immense increase in unemployment in Australia, to the extent that in May 1975 there were 248 000 unemployed people registered in Australia.

The figures I will now give are Commonwealth Employment Service figures. I point out that between May 1975 and May 1976, when the policies of the Whitlam Government were directed towards reducing unemploy-

ment, the increase in the number of unemployed persons was 10 841 for a 12-month period, because of the effects of the Hayden Budget and the activities of the Federal Labor Government.

From May 1976 to May 1977 the number of unemployed persons increased by 62 278. From May 1977 to May 1978 it increased by 70 980, so that it is absolutely futile for members opposite to lay the total blame for the increase in employment at the door of the Whitlam Government. It is clear that when their colleagues came to Government in Canberra the rate of increase in unemployment had slowed dramatically. There have been two sudden bursts in the number of unemployed persons since then.

If honourable members opposite wish to argue with Commonwealth Employment Service figures, I quote to them the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, which show a more marked decrease in unemployment between May 1975 and May 1976 when the Whitlam Government was in power until November, before the coup took place. These figures indicate that there was a drop of 5 000 in the number of unemployed persons in Australia. Since then, the figure has increased from 247 600 to 395 300.

Whichever way the position is examined, it is clear that there has been a 50 per cent increase in the number of unemployed persons. I am not prepared to say directly it is as a result of the Fraser Government, but there has been this increase during the period of the Fraser Government. I repeat that whilst it is clear that the Fraser Government did not create and was not responsible for the initial unemployment (and neither was the Whitlam Government) the Fraser Government's direct policies of reducing public expenditure has had a severe effect on it.

Mr. Mathwin: There was very little unemployment when they took office: they soon got stuck into it!

Mr. KENEALLY: If the honourable member had followed what I have said he would be aware that I have already covered that point: there is no need to repeat it. The Deputy Leader, who has been listening to some of the things I have been saying, may be able to speak to his more dense colleague about the matter.

Mr. Edward Goldsmith, in his essay "The Ecological Approach to Unemployment", states:

Unemployment is much more than material deprivation. A job, in an industrial society, provides much more than material benefits. It also provides those people, who in a disintegrated society have been deprived of an extended family and a cohesive community, with a surrogate social environment and hence with a feeling of security, an identity and a goal structure, all of which are psychologically difficult to dispense with.

He also states:

It is not surprising that prolonged unemployment leads to all sorts of social deviations. Marital breakdowns are the most obvious, as unemployed husbands are most likely to vent their frustrations and loss of self-esteem on their wives and family. It also leads to a rise in the incidence of alcoholism, drug addiction and other such expedients for insulating them from an environment that has ceased to satisfy basic psychological needs, and also of delinquency and indulgence in crime which enables them to acquire a new surrogate social environment even if it be that of a criminal sub-culture. It is no coincidence that the incidence of all these behavioural aberrations is highest among teenagers, particularly those from minority groups among whom unemployment levels are high.

If Opposition members have any doubt as to the extent of unemployment and its effect, I invite them to visit my office in Port Augusta at any time they wish and spend a week there.

Port Augusta is often said to be the crossroads of the

transport corridors in Australia, and people have been encouraged to go there by the CES because it says jobs are available in Port Augusta. That is not true, and the stream of people who come into the Federal member's office and into my office at Port Augusta who are totally penniless and who have nowhere to go and no-one to help them is large indeed. These are not people whose condition is their own fault; these are people whose condition is the fault of society. As responsible members of society, I would hope members on both sides would have some regard for their welfare. I think that a brief spell in a Labor district office would be a salutary experience, indeed, for members opposite.

Dr. Eastick: Don't you think the same applies elsewhere? Be consistent.

Mr. KENEALLY: If the extent of unemployment is as high elsewhere as it is in Labor districts, then why in the blazes are members opposite not complaining about it? Why are they not standing up and criticising and putting the blame where it belongs? Why aren't they encouraging the Government to provide employment and contracts for the workers of this country? For Governments to constrict their spending in a time of high unemployment means disaster; we are right back to 1930, 1931 and 1932.

One would have thought that this country and the world would have learned something by the experience of the 1930's, but obviously they have not. If Opposition members believe that unemployment in their districts is as high as it obviously is in my district, I hope that they will do something about it. There has been not one comment during this session from the Opposition as regards unemployment; that is an indication. All the interjections in the world will not overcome that basic factor. The Leader of the Opposition during his hour-long diatribe not once referred to the plight of the unemployed. The deposed Leader on the back bench is the spokesman for the Liberal Party in South Australia. He does not lead the Party on issues of great importance. He does not set the pace, but only interjects from the back bench. There has been not one word from the Leader of the Opposition about the great tragedy of unemployment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the last time that I will warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. KENEALLY: Thank you, Sir, for your protection once again: I certainly need it. I have to speak loudly to get over the interjections. Opposition members are embarrassed, and surely they need to be. One of the most obvious causes of high unemployment is increased productivity, as a result of increased automation. For example, in the U.S.A. the five largest industries—primary metals, stones and clay and glass, food, chemicals and paper—provide only 7.3 per cent of the nation's jobs. Particularly alarming is the fact that between 1950 and 1970 they provided no new employment at all. In the steel industry, from 1959 to 1969, employment actually declined from 450 000 to 100 000—a pattern that is clearly discernible in other industrial countries.

Mr. Allison: Of course it is.

Mr. KENEALLY: The honourable member should be patient, and not stupid, as is his wont, but he is not interested.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier has already spoken. I call him to order.

Mr. KENEALLY: In fact, on present trends, it is totally unrealistic to regard the manufacturing industry as likely to provide a significant source of new jobs in the coming decades. The jobs will need to come from service and tertiary industries. This lack of work opportunities in the manufacturing industries is a direct result of the capitalist

system. The free-enterprise ethic, based on the need to continue to make high profits, operates its activities with that goal in mind. Therefore, if it is profitable to replace people with machines, that is done, with no concern shown for the social consequences. Machines, after all, do not complain about conditions of employment, hours of work, and do not require sick leave or annual leave, etc.

So, in the drive for increased profits the workers become the dispensable units. They may be kept on if they are prepared to work at a cost less than that of replacing them with machines. If they are prepared to accept a reduction in their living standards, their jobs may be retained. This is a threat they have hanging over their heads all the time. It is also the threat the Federal Government wields over the trade union movement when unions try to obtain for their workers an increase or a reasonable part of the gross national product. After all, is this not the role of trade unions? They must have a concern for the welfare of their members.

I can tell the Opposition that the proposition that workers are going to receive a reduced living standard merely to prop up the multi-national and trans-national corporations, so that they can continue to make a profit and represent a threat to Governments and communities, is not on. The world is progressing to a stage where, if that mentality persists, there will be a confrontation.

I believe that the capitalist world is now at crisis point. The drive for profit, growth, and high technology results in fewer jobs and more unemployment. This pattern will continue, and the remedy cannot be left to private interests, who bear no community responsibility whatsoever. They will continue to reduce employment, and the results of that policy will be left to Governments to contend with.

Governments need to be more closely involved in the business activities within their own boundaries, not less as the Opposition would hope, because, above all, we need to have concern for and to protect the interests of unemployed people.

The only result of a continuing and increasing level of unemployment will be a revolt by the unemployed, and we ignore this possibility at our own risk. Governments, unions, and industry should be meeting to discuss ways of solving this problem, not only in Australia but on a world-wide basis.

It is obvious that multi-national and trans-national corporations and the sort of ethic and philosophy that the Opposition will slavishly support, based purely on the motive of profit, have no regard for community interest in the unemployed. When one balances increased profits against unemployment, increased profits will always win. That is the role of private enterprise. It leaves it to Governments to solve the difficulties of the unemployed, but that is no longer a viable proposition. We should seriously question the assumption that increased productivity in times of unemployment will assist in this problem. Increased productivity in such times is highly illusory. People who support this argument forget that per capita productivity in an industry might increase, but not a country's total labour force. If we increase productivity of individuals in any industry and reduce the number of employed by installing machines and computers, we might reduce the productivity unit cost per employee in the industry but, when related to the industry as a whole, with its ever-increasing unemployment, the rate of productivity increase is illusory.

I wonder whether in a highly competitive situation we can expect private companies to continue employing people if they can see that, by using machines, they will maximise their profit potential. They will not do so,

because they are forced by competitors in other industries to get rid of people and to employ labour-saving devices.

Mr. Venning: World demand.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am pleased that the honourable member has said that. World demand in a few years will be for more jobs, not for increased profits and dividends, but for basic jobs—the human response to a critical situation. The honourable member cannot come to terms with that. We have a paradox in the Federal Government's present policies: it provides a 40 per cent subsidy for businesses to buy new equipment, but businesses are using that 40 per cent to buy labour-saving equipment. The result of that 40 per cent subsidy is an increase in unemployment.

At the same time, the Federal Government is pouring millions of dollars into a scheme to retrain those people at jobs that are not apparent and will not become apparent. It is reducing public expenditure, reducing the jobs available, and increasing unemployment. If that is not a paradox, I do not know what is. It indicates clearly that the Federal Government has no viable economic policy and no policy on unemployment or the remedy for it.

Mr. Venning: Not half.

Mr. KENEALLY: I expect the honourable gentleman will enlighten the House on the Federal Government's policy to reduce unemployment. His own Federal Minister, and his department, have stated that unemployment in Australia will reach more than 500 000, a tragic statistic. It is not tragic, of course, to the member for Rocky River and I can say why. I pass his property two or three times a week. He does not care about unemployment. This tragic statistic will rise to 520 000 people when school-leavers enter the work force next February. That is not meant to be a sensational statistic, but it is one that unfortunately could well be achieved by the Fraser Government, which is setting new records all the time. I hope it is ashamed of this record. The figure of 520 000 is not an unrealistic assessment of the number of people who will be seeking jobs next February, but I am sad to say that the honourable gentleman opposite seems to be rather complacent about that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The Premier said that by December it would be a million. That is in a newspaper clipping. You're talking out of the back of your neck.

Mr. Venning: What about that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel will have an opportunity to speak. I hope he will cease interjecting.

Mr. KENEALLY: As you so wisely say, Sir, he will have an opportunity to expand his interjection when he speaks. I would be delighted if, as a result of my contribution to this debate, I have prompted the honourable member to address himself to the subject of unemployment, something his colleagues have assiduously avoided. I suspect that, in the hour available to him, only a small percentage of his time will be directed to this problem.

Mr. Goldsworthy: There are other things.

Mr. KENEALLY: If the honourable member can point to one other subject of greater importance, from the State viewpoint, nationally or internationally, than the increasing millions of unemployed and the thousands of millions of unemployed in some of the Third World countries, I would be surprised at his priorities. The member for Rocky River shakes his head once again; he couldn't care less.

The remedies for unemployment will be difficult to find. Perhaps, as a community we will have to consider a reduction in growth. Perhaps we will have to consider moving away from large, expensive, and labour-saving machines to smaller machines needing more people to operate them, and in some cases away from machines

altogether and back to personal exertion, so that people are able to play a part once again in benefiting society at large by their own efforts, and more particularly having some control in benefiting their own circumstances.

I am dismayed by the flippant attitude of Opposition members to this subject. The hope of the unemployed people is not in the private enterprise ethic. Private enterprise will not do what is needed to increase employment. That remains with the Government. As long as private enterprise is more interested in making huge profits, at the expense of the community and regardless of social consequences, we cannot expect any improvement in the present situation. What is needed is greater and more involved Government activity in industry at all levels in Australia and elsewhere.

Mr. Goldsworthy: No.

Mr. KENEALLY: Members opposite say that is not required. Yesterday, the Leader sneered at a suggestion that we should be seeking to combine the best of the capitalist system (whatever that is) with the best of the communist system (whatever that is) to come to a system that will help Australia. They sneered at the communist system. They might well do so, but if a person is unemployed, on the bread line, with a family to support, he might not sneer at a country where at least people are employed. He might not sneer at a country such as China, where 900 000 000 are employed. In Australia, for the past 80 years, we have had predominantly conservative Governments controlling our Federal and State systems. We have been a complete and total failure in our efforts to provide a reasonable standard of living for the people of this country.

In China, 900 000 000 are employed; in a country of some 15 000 000, with immense wealth and with the greatest mineral resources in the world, we are unable to match that performance. If that is not a reflection on the capitalist system, I do not know what is.

We need a concerted attack on unemployment. The sooner our people and unemployed people throughout the world can take pride in their contribution to society, the better for society. The Federal Liberal Government and its supporters here who slavishly follow its philosophies must realise that increased and sustained levels of unemployment can result only in an uprising of people in that position. If they realise that, something might be done to remedy it. I hope that members opposite will address themselves to this subject much more than they do at present, and stop this cynical and inane sniggering and objecting when someone tries to promote some sort of theory that might assist.

I turn now to a problem that is of some concern to people in my district and the surrounding region. I refer to the proposed petro-chemical development at Redcliff. Having lived in a country centre all my life, I am aware of the benefits that can come to the country by increased development within the area. Port Augusta, in recent years, has had a growth rate of 3 per cent or 4 per cent. Although it has slowed down within the past 18 months, it is still probably as high as, if not higher than, any other country centre in South Australia. To a small extent, it has provided jobs for school leavers, but it has not provided the range of activities or occupations for all children who seek to obtain employment within that city.

More particularly, the problem at Port Pirie is more extreme because, although there is a slow growth rate at Port Augusta, there is no growth rate at all at Port Pirie. I think that statistics will show that the population in that city has dropped in recent years. The people within the cities of Port Augusta and Port Pirie are not looking for dramatic growth; they are looking for a sustained growth

that provides work opportunities to the children who are born and grow up in those towns. Those work opportunities should therefore provide a range of manual, skilled and tertiary positions. It is important in country centres to be able to retain the youth in those centres. There has been a definite trend for young people to leave country centres to come to the cities to seek work and their future. They are followed by their parents when they retire so that they can be near their children.

The problem that will exist in that area as a result of Redcliff is not a growth of 2, 3 or 4 per cent—it is a growth rate more like 20 per cent. This growth rate will bring extreme pressure on some areas of activity within that region. I refer particularly to accommodation, labour and social structures.

When the work force of the Redcliff petro-chemical plant (if it eventuates) is added to the construction force that will already exist as a result of the new powerhouse, we will have within that area many thousands of highly paid construction workers. They will place a premium on land, houses and flats in the area that local people will have to try to meet. The cost of accommodation will expand enormously. This will be a burden that the community must face. Young people who grow up in the area and wish to marry must compete with these highly paid construction workers who come into the town.

Motels and caravan parks will be overcrowded, and that will not only affect the tourist industry but will also affect people who need to come to these areas because of work, people who have a transient relationship to the cities, and who need to stay a night or two but who will be unable to find accommodation. We will have an extreme position in Port Augusta, and particularly in Port Pirie.

I have mentioned the pressure that is likely to be placed on labour. The local contractors, the local council and local industry will have to compete with the high wages that will be offered by construction companies. That will be a bonus to the workers involved, and I do not deny them that right at all. I say good luck to them. Many people in Port Augusta, Port Pirie, and Whyalla will take advantage of high wages, as they should. However, those high wages will cause problems for normal employees in those communities because they must compete with the high wages to obtain labour. There will be the extremely high increase in the cost of living within the area. There will also be extreme pressure put on social structures. At the moment the cities do not have the social facilities to accommodate 3 000 to 5 000 people who could come to the area as a result of this development. The number of people coming to the area could be even more than that. We have heard figures quoted about the infrastructure and the construction costs of the plant itself, but there is much more in the growth pattern that will be set up as a result of the Redcliff development.

We will have thousands of single men in the area with very little to do in their spare time. There is no need for me to explain the sorts of social pressures that will be placed particularly on young girls in the area. Initially it will be great for them, because they will have a wide field from which to choose. The long-term effects are not as beneficial as might first be seen.

One of the problems we face in Australia is that no studies have been made in relation to this sort of difficulty. We had, a few years ago, the example of Gladstone in Queensland, an example that is relevant to our position in the north. I am quite sure that the Government is well aware of that matter. I am also sure that the Government is aware of all I am saying and is quite sympathetic towards points that I am making. I compliment the Government on its actions in sending the Town Clerk of Port Augusta, Mr.

Harry Richards, overseas on the Keith Hockridge Overseas Study Memorial Scholarship. His report is comprehensive and is a must for all members who may be interested in the sorts of problem that occur from rapid growth. I believe it is an important document, and I am sure that it will be heeded by the State Government in its efforts to try to overcome the difficulties that I have suggested will occur.

What we need in the northern cities of Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Whyalla are town planning officers to provide a scheme of development that will accommodate this rapid growth. It is normally expected that a two-year lead period is needed. That time no longer exists, so it is absolutely imperative that a decision be made as soon as possible about Redcliff, if for no other reason than to enable communities in that area to do the planning that is so essential.

There seems to be a feeling abroad in the area that Port Augusta is anxious to retain for itself all the development. That is so far from the truth as to be almost ridiculous. The people of Port Augusta are horrified at the prospects of what might happen to what is now a lovely city and a nice place to live. We believe that the growth rate should be shared as equally as possible with those other equally nice places to live, Whyalla and Port Pirie, particularly Port Pirie because it has not in recent years had the advantage of any growth at all.

Whyalla has a labour pool (unemployment there is the highest in South Australia, possibly in Australia), of which advantage needs to be taken. I suggest to the planners who will ultimately decide where the Redcliff plant will be (and I am firmly convinced that it will be at the Redcliff site because that is the most appropriate place for it) that they provide as far as possible equal access to the plant for workers in the three cities. I would also suggest that towns such as Quorn, Wilmington and Port Germein will also benefit enormously because people might choose to live in what is a quieter and in some cases a more pleasant environment.

I was amused recently to read in the press in Port Augusta that the Leader of the Opposition and, I suspect, one or two of his colleagues flew over Redcliff, looked at it from the air and determined that it was the site for the petro-chemical plant. One must contrast that attitude with the years of criticism and opposition to the Redcliff site being the logical site for the development. If members opposite want to object or disagree with me on that point, I would point out that I have taken the trouble to run through the debate and questions on Redcliff to see what the Leader, the Deputy Leader and particularly the member for Davenport have said about locating the plant at Redcliff. All that has gone by the way.

The Liberal Party in South Australia has suddenly found that the development is a distinct possibility. They must now take a share of the credit, so up to the north came the Leader of the Opposition; he flew over Redcliff and determined that that should be the site. It cannot go to Whyalla or Adelaide; it must be there.

I asked in a letter addressed to the press in my district where the honourable gentleman had been for the past six years. He did not take any interest in the area at all, because he said the development would not take place; it would not happen. It was an election gimmick, a pie-in-the-sky that would not happen. He criticised the project for several years until he found out that it was a possibility, and then he wrote letters to all the Liberal Party leaders in Australia, including the Prime Minister, saying that they should support the project because he had discovered at last that it was a possibility. That meant they had to ignore what he had been saying for the past six years. Obviously,

he had been wrong. He said, "I have been misled by my colleagues, but now that it is a possibility, I want to share in the credit for it." I said in my letter—

Mr. Gunn: It was an extremely good letter.

Mr. KENEALLY: I thank the member for Eyre for congratulating me on it.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am prepared to accept the praise of the honourable member. The Leader's action seems to me to be an exercise in political opportunism, something not entirely unusual in the activities of members opposite.

I wished to say much more about this problem of growth in my district and how I see the community participating in it, but I have had time only to give a precis. The importance of unemployment is such that it has merited the greatest percentage of my time in this debate. I ask members opposite to raise their voices with ours to convince the Federal Government that its policy is one of madness and disaster. I say again that I do not believe that the policies of the Federal Labor Government or Federal Liberal Government can be seen as being totally responsible for the high unemployment; other factors are involved. What the Federal Liberal Government is now doing, however, is exacerbating the problem. The policies go right back to the 1930's, when similar policies exacerbated the great depression, and they will bring on the workers of this country the same situation unless they are stopped.

I support the motion. I applaud the contributions of the members who moved and seconded it, and others who have spoken on this subject. I also hope to see members opposite participate in what is the critical issue and the most pressing problem that this State, country, and the world have to face at the moment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I will refer later to one or two matters referred to by the member for Stuart. The honourable member suggested that speakers in this debate should confine themselves solely to the question of unemployment, but he saw fit to mention one or two other matters related to his own district, so he did not see fit to take his own advice.

My traditional support of the Governor's Speech does not signify that I agree with many of the sentiments expressed by that honourable gentleman in that speech.

In referring to the death of Mr. Frank Potter, who was a senior member of the Liberal Party for many years and was President of the Legislative Council, I wish to say that he was a kindly, accomplished and gentlemanly person, who had few enemies in either Party and who made a significant contribution to the welfare of this State. I join others in expressing sympathy to his wife and family and indeed appreciation of the services he gave to the State.

I found the Speech of the Governor an uninspiring document, and that is to put a charitable complexion on it. We were regaled by doctrinaire recitations by at least two Government members. You, Sir, made a somewhat more thoughtful contribution. I heard most of what the recently elected member for Morphett said, and it was my misfortune to sit through the one-hour speech of the member for Stuart who has been in this place long enough to have been educated, at least in part.

The burden of those two speeches was to the effect that the Federal Government can spend its way out of the unemployment problem by increasing the Government or public sector. In other words, it should spend money it does not have. The Premier made much play earlier in the week of the fact that the Federal deficit is astronomical, comparing South Australia's position favourably to that.

Spending Government money on the public sector has been tried before and it has failed to solve the problems of unemployment. No easy options are open for Australia in its present economic dilemma and the sooner members opposite realise that the better. If easy options were available the Federal Government would be exercising them. I do not believe the Federal Government gets any joy out of putting severe curbs on spending in the Government sector.

The way to make oneself popular in Government is to splash money around in the public sector. To take the course which the Federal Government has charted knowing it is the only course and only option open to Australia shows a degree of courage that no Treasurer in the preceding Whitlam Government showed, except perhaps the past Treasurer of that regime, Mr. Hayden, who is now Leader of the Opposition. He was the only Federal Treasurer on the Labor side who showed any semblance of economic sanity in his approach to the question of the problems that had arisen in the economy during the life of the Whitlam Administration. He was the only one who made statements similar to those made by succeeding Liberal Treasurers about what should be done to put this country on the right course.

Mr. Hayden has been saying this sort of thing more recently. His statements seem to me to have been reasonably sensible; certainly they are far at variance with the doctrinaire stuff trotted out by the member for Stuart and earlier by the member for Morphett, that we can spend our way out of trouble by spending money in the public sector by spending money we do not have. At the same time Labor members are calling for cuts in taxation. The Lynch policy led to tax indexation, which put more incentive into the system for people to earn more money. The great escalation in taxation rip-offs occurred in this country when inflation was raging, when taxpayers' incomes were getting into higher brackets, and they were paying more and more tax with the cost of goods escalating.

In fact, the money he was taking home was buying less and less. That got cracking during the Whitlam years, so do not let the apologists opposite forget that. I totally reject the economic philosophy of the Premier, the member for Morphett and all of the others who fancy themselves as economic spokesmen for that Government. Later, I will refer to some of the difficulties that we are facing in South Australia that have come about by the following of that policy by the Dunstan Administration over a period of years. The day of reckoning is at hand for the fiscal policies of the Dunstan Administration. I point out that we are in poorer shape than are other States as a result of those policies.

There is talk of mineral reserves. At least the Federal Leader of the Opposition acknowledges that three-quarters of employment in this country is provided by the private sector. Before the Labor Government was swept out of office after the double dissolution, the statement was being made that we must provide a climate for the growth and expansion of the private sector because that is where the jobs are. That came from a Labor spokesman, but it is not the sort of thing we are hearing from members of the Labor Party in South Australia at present.

The member for Stuart mentioned the vast wealth of this country: he referred to the mineral wealth. I ask him who are the people who mucked up the export of the vast mineral wealth of Western Australia? Who were the people who caused the trouble there? I do not believe it was the Western Australian Liberal Government. That Government was negotiating with the Japanese for the export of those minerals. One does not have to be a genius

to realise who was making unrealistic demands up in the mining fields and who were the people crueLLing the pitch for themselves and for Australia in relation to the price of ore to the Japanese.

Mr. Groom: Don't you think there should be any controls?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course there should be controls, but I do not subscribe to the economic theories subscribed to by that honourable gentleman and reiterated today by the member for Stuart. To spend one's way out of trouble with money one has not got in circumstances of raging inflation, which will increase inflation, is economic lunacy. I would have thought that members opposite would have learned that lesson.

There are no easy options for Australia. There are no easy options for this Government in South Australia, if it only knew it. It has been a Government of easy options since it came into Government. It is easy to promise and to spend money in the public sector. The public loves Governments spending money, but it does not like it when Governments are raising money and when the tax starts to bite. When the Government says, "We have done this," and "We have done that", all it has done is spend the public's money, it is not the Government's money.

Mr. Groom: What about the subsidies given to the private sector?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I intended to comment later about observations I made in Britain. The member for Stuart said today that Governments must become more and more involved in industry, it must buy into them, it must get into the act, and that this will solve our economic problems. That has not been my observation, when one is considering a competitive world situation, which one is on the national scene. We, in South Australia, are viewing a competitive situation in relation to other States, and any competitiveness South Australia has had long since disappeared under this Administration.

The country is in a competitive situation in relation to other nations, and Britain's entry into the European Economic Community has exacerbated some of those problems. The industries that the British Government has propped up are in most serious trouble. The nationalised steel industry, for instance, lost, I think about \$600 000 000 Australian last year on a declining steel market, whereas the production in France is rising quite rapidly.

Mr. Groom: They lost proportionately more than that in the 1940's and the 1930's.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They were selling more steel in the 1940's, certainly, but to suggest that by nationalising an industry, as they have, will solve the problem is nonsense. The fact is that about \$A600 000 000 has to be made up by every taxpayer in Britain. Do not fool ourselves with the theories espoused by the Premier that that sort of money can be raised from the tall poppies; it cannot be done. That sort of money is raised from every taxpayer in the country.

The complaint I heard from all walks of life in Britain, from the woman taking in boarders to supplement her income, the cab driver who drove me to Heathrow Airport, and the fellow working at the local council office, is that there is no incentive to earn more nowadays. Whether they are the victims of propaganda, I do not know, but I have more faith in the average citizen than to believe that. The average citizen in Britain has lost his incentive because of taxation, which has to be raised to finance these tremendous losses in industries, such as the steel industry, which have been nationalised.

I mention Leyland: there was a row on. There are experts on the car industry in this House, people who have

been involved with the unions in the car industry (the member for Semaphore for instance). A section of Leyland went on strike while I was in Britain, because workers were asked to separate (and this is the way it was reported) good panels from bad panels. I do not know the details, but I assume these were pressings from the line. The workers refused to do that because they had not been required to do it in the past—that was the reason! The board of Leyland was faced with a dilemma, because it is State-controlled. Leyland was losing money, because it had ground to a halt, but what could the board do? It could not stand anybody down because it is a nationalised industry and that is not acceptable to the unions. How on earth one resolves that sort of dispute, I do not know.

General Motors-Holden's and other vehicle manufacturers are bitterly criticised for standing workers down when the production line grinds to a halt. At Leylands they cannot do that when these little union rows flare up from time to time. In those cases, they have the whole work force idle because it is a nationalised industry. How that is doing anything for the economy of the country, I do not know. I totally reject the proposition put by the member for Stuart, that we will solve our problems by the Government buying into the private sector. That would be disastrous.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The honourable member for Kavel has the floor.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will carry on with this theme, because the Government's unemployment relief scheme is a case in point. The Government is proud of the fact that it spent \$22 000 000 last year on its unemployment relief scheme, but it is sorry that it can spend only \$17 000 000 this year. Let us examine this matter in some detail. On the surface, that looks laudable, and the Premier has made points publicly about it. What full-time employment has been provided in South Australia as a result of that \$22 000 000? The Premier claims that there has been permanent work found for some people. I would like to find out how many permanent jobs have come from the expenditure of that \$22 000 000 last year.

That is a short-term, stop-gap patch that was put over the hole in the leaking ship here to make the employment figures look more acceptable, but the Government has done nothing in South Australia to stimulate long-term employment. It is hoping that something will turn up, that there will be a change in the economic climate, and that jobs will be created in South Australia and throughout the country. I know that it has been popular for the Premier at times to knock the Playford era and at other times to jump on the Playford band waggon, but it is an historic fact that, during the depression years through succeeding Liberal Governments, this State came from being the poorest State to being one of the most prosperous States as a result of prudent Liberal Administrations over the years which improved our competitive situation with other States, and we opened markets in other States as a result. None of the Playford bashers, including the member for Morphett, can deny that fact. We have had an argument about the relative growth in the public sector since 1971, and figures were selectively quoted by the Premier, but I do not know who cooked them up for him.

Mr. Tonkin: Misquoted, I would say.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He quoted figures from two different periods, put them together, and came up with a completely false conclusion. Growth in the public sector in South Australia has far outstripped that of other States. Anyone prepared truthfully to use statistics could come to no other conclusion. I have made the point that there are

several areas of Government which, in my opinion, could be undertaken more successfully and more profitably so that the public would get greater value for money spent than by Government intrusion into these areas. It is a cheap political ploy for the Government to say that the Liberals would sack people. The Federal Government has managed to reduce the numbers in the Federal Public Service without sacking but by means of attrition, so it is possible for it to happen. Let us not have that nonsense and scaremongering.

The Public Buildings Department, under a Labor Administration, has become larger than it need be, and many of the functions assumed by that department could be done more profitably and with greater value for money spent by the private sector in South Australia. At present, private industry in South Australia is having to put people off because there is no work. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith): We have heard several references over the past few sitting days to the Commonwealth Government and its policies aimed at reducing Government expenditure at the Federal level to the absolute minimum, in the vain hope that this in turn will unlock money for the private sector to stimulate and restore our flagging economy. This policy has been a singular failure in the economic area, but I refer to an aspect of this policy that demonstrates the inhuman and distorting effect on the social policies of not just the Federal Government but I would have thought of the Australian community as a whole. According to the Commonwealth directory, the Department of Social Security is set up:

To provide income security and associated welfare services to the community and to plan social advancement. They are laudable aims, and aims which have been supported in a bi-partisan manner over the years, but I am afraid that, in relation to this particular department, the effects of the policy of the Fraser Government and the hard line on expenditure, its function has been ignored and distorted in a way that has made it operate in a totally opposite sense to those aims.

In fact, rather than providing income security and associated welfare services, in some respects the priorities of the Department of Social Security, as dictated to it by the Government, has been to change that definition to one whereby it is acting as a kind of underhand inquiry agent for snooping and investigating people's private lives, with a view to actively discouraging people from applying for assistance and for minimising the amount to be spent in this vital social area. That is a Ministerial or Cabinet direction.

The distortion of this department and its functions is one of the saddest things that has happened in this country in the past two or three years of the Fraser Government. I have the utmost sympathy for the departmental staff, many of whom have been there for many years, who actively assist people who come to their counter, and who have a genuine humanity and understanding for the problems and the people with whom they deal. But their task has been made impossible, their morale has been lowered, and their reputation has been besmirched by the sort of policies and activities being undertaken by the

department.

These are not idle words. I will give a solid and concrete example that has come to my attention. Yesterday, a constituent of mine was visited by an individual claiming to be a representative of an insurance company. He said, "I am representing an insurance company; we are investigating a road accident. Can you tell me whether the name of the family over the road is X or Y?" In fact, one of those names was the name of the family, and the woman, who was acquainted with the family, but not a friend, confirmed that they were in this case, Y.

He then asked "Do they own a Valiant car, because it has been involved in an accident?" She said, "No, I am not aware that they did." He said, "What sort of car does the husband drive?" She told him. He said, "What sort of car does the wife drive?" She told him the situation there. He said, "When did you last see the husband?" At this stage my constituent became a little suspicious. She did not like the look of the individual for a start. He had not produced identification, although she had not asked him to do so, and she just wondered what the drift of the questions was.

The reason she felt suspicious was that the question about the husband was fairly pointed in that the woman over the road had been separated from her husband for about a year, and was in fact living alone with a small child in the house. She did not want to tell a stranger that that was the family situation. She was not quite sure whether he was in fact a representative of an insurance company, or merely a private individual following up a road accident, or perhaps somebody with some more sinister intent.

So, in response to the question, "When did you last see the husband?" she said quite truthfully, "It was some days ago." In fact, the husband had called, as he did periodically, to pick up the child or to see his child, but she implied that the husband was living in a family situation with the woman, because as I say, she was a little concerned about the intentions of this stranger who was questioning her about an acquaintance.

"What," said this person, "is the best time to call?" My constituent said, "Probably weekends." With that, the person left, on foot—a further note of suspicion. One expects insurance representatives or salesmen in the field to have a company car and to drive it to the location while doing their investigation. However, she thought no more about it. Some half-hour or so later, she walked around the corner to catch the bus to go into town, and there she saw the insurance agent. What was most interesting was not his furtive manner or his obvious surprise at seeing her, but the fact that he was sitting in a white Commonwealth car.

My constituent is no fool. She realised that insurance agents should not be driving Commonwealth cars, so she challenged him. On being challenged, he produced his identification, which indicated that he was an investigator from the Social Security Department. There is the scurrilous situation—an investigator purporting to be an insurance salesman, speaking to a neighbour, attempting in an underhand fashion to find out information and, worse than that, because of his demeanour and the way in which he approached it, being given wrong information implicitly by the person he was questioning, who thought she was protecting the woman under investigation.

The social security people presumably were trying to find out whether or not this woman, who had been a claimant for a pension, was living with her husband. She was not, but because of the investigator's method of conducting his investigation, he had been told by a neighbour and no doubt would write in his report that she was known in the district to be living with her husband.

What a scandalous and scurrilous situation!

Let us look at the further background of this matter. The woman has been separated from her husband for more than a year, and lives alone with a small child. The husband naturally calls occasionally to see the child. She had applied for assistance from the Social Security Department and had had an interview. She was operating a small business, which was returning about \$17 to \$20 a week. The business is on the point of going out of operation. In order to supplement that income, her only income source that was coming in steadily, she washed dishes at night and earned some \$25. She was concerned that having to do this job affected her ability to look after her child, and so she had gone to the department to see whether or not she might qualify for a pension.

From her experience, and on hearing the way in which they conduct their investigations, that woman has probably been put off going near this Government service, which is aimed at aiding and assisting claimants for social benefits. No doubt the Fraser Government will chalk that up as another victory, another person no doubt legitimately claiming aid who would not feel inclined to do so, and thus a few more dollars would be saved. This is why I say the department's whole function and purpose has been totally distorted by these inhuman policies. I have heard of the interviews—or perhaps they should be called interrogations—that have taken place, where women are asked, no doubt hoping that shock will trick them into some sort of answer which the department can use to disqualify them, questions such as, "How many men have you slept with, and what have they paid you?" That was asked in a specific case.

The department has the initials "S.S."; they are sinister initials indeed, if one looks at the goings on of its investigators in the field. What is, in fact, going on? Where is this going to stop? When will the department be told by its Minister, "Your job is humanity and social support, and not investigation, interrogation, and general discouragement of people in need." It is scandalous that this should be going on at Commonwealth level. Thank goodness we have a Community Welfare Department in our State to act with humanity.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The matter I wish to raise arises as the result of a letter I have received from the Barossa Range Pest Plants Steering Committee. It would be best if I were to read the letter to the House. It states:

Local Government knows that the Pest Plants Commission has a difficult task in bringing about a board system to control pest plants in this State. Local government also knows the problem the Government is faced with in trying to bring about better production in primary industry by reducing and even eliminating those plants which lower the quality and quantity of profitable crops and pastures.

There is indeed a need in the interests of all South Australians to increase our exportable primary produce to provide a greater flow of funds into the State. Increased production can mean lower commodity costs to the consumer within the State so that any effort to improve production by the control and eradication of pest plants can result in benefit for the whole South Australian public.

The whole of the primary production areas of South Australia can be said to be the back garden for the State's urban areas. Without a fully productive garden one can expect less to eat at the tables or perhaps the same but at a much higher cost. It is, therefore, reasonable that the "gardens" alone should not bear the full brunt of a problem which affects every person in the State.

In bringing down the present pest plants legislation the State Government accepted that the problem is one that should not be financed solely from the financial resources of

the producer himself. However, only a very meagre subsidy provision was built into the legislation, which left the bulk of the cost to be borne by an industry which, in the present economic climate, is hard pressed to make ends meet.

It must be remembered that there are two areas of responsibility for pest plant control: one being the producer's own land and the other being the public property. The legislation says that the producer must deal with the problem in both areas, mostly at his cost, whether or not he can afford it. The unfair part about the legislation is that the producer is required under threat of penalty to bear more than his fair share of the cost of control in the public area.

Think about the costs! Urban John Citizen pays his State and local taxes and from them comes the meagre subsidy for pest plant control, and probably built into urban local taxes is a near zero figure for pest plant control. Now let's look at rural John Citizen's financial commitment:

- (1) He pays a small measure through his State taxes.
- (2) He pays much more through his local taxes, and the legislation can require an expenditure of up to 3 per cent of rate revenue.
- (3) He is financially responsible for pest plants control on public roads.
- (4) He of course, must bear the full cost of control on his property.
- (5) His production is reduced because of the competing plants and in consequence his income is reduced.

So, whilst urban John Citizen, having paid his small contribution, can sit back and watch the footy on telly, rural John Citizen is digging further into his pocket and the soil in an effort to comply with a rather discriminatory piece of legislation. One cannot blame urban John Citizen for doing what he does, but one can blame the legislation which fails to spread the financial burden of pest plants control fairly. In this day and age of "one vote one value", one must expect each voter to bear his fair share of the cost legislation forces on all voters.

The present franchise in this State suggests that the public costs of pest plant control should be borne by the public as a whole and, to achieve this, boards set up by the Pest Plants Commission should be financed fully from State coffers.

Local governing bodies comprising the boards should contribute to the extent of the local administrative and control measures peculiar to a particular area. The producer's role is heavy enough in controlling the plants on his own property, as well as contributing through his State and local taxes, without being required to pay above the State's per capita figure.

Pest plant boards already established are required to "tax" their associated councils far more than is reasonably justified. They may feel that what they are paying is reasonable, but, if they look at the overall State figures, they would find that on a per capita basis their electors are being charged considerably more than they should be.

Councils which have delayed forming boards and which can continue an acceptable level of pest plant control would do well to press their members of Parliament to move for change in the present legislation and bring about a fairer means of contribution to the public cost of pest plant control. Likewise, existing boards have much to gain for the electors of their member councils if they also press for legislative change.

It is a simple exercise to work out the present per capita cost of weed control in South Australia and to compare it to the per capita cost of weed control in your own board or council area. It will vary from area to area but, in many cases, electors in areas with small urban development will be shown to pay near double the State average per capita cost. After doing the exercise, councils and boards should draw their local member of Parliament's attention to the result and ask

for legislative change.

These days, more than ever before, local government is being used by other levels of Government (through the bureaucracy) to do "the dirty work" of government—to carry out the unpopular issues.

Invariably, added responsibilities are pushed on to local government without adequate financial backing, and pest plants control is just one example. What appeared on the surface to be a generous piece of noxious weeds legislation is now known to be a spurious alternative to the old Noxious Weeds Act. If the Pest Plants Commission is to be an effective force in pest plants control it must have acceptable and workable legislation. Very little headway has been made by the commission since its formation and, whilst it is working with legislation generally unacceptable to local government and the people it represents, there is little chance of further progress.

Then follows an exhortation for local government to get cracking. I thought that the most expeditious way of raising this matter in the House was to read that submission by the Pest Plants Steering Committee from the Barossa Range. I hope that someone gets hold of the *Hansard* proofs when complaints are raised during the grievance debates, and draws them to the attention of the relevant Ministers. This leads me to say that I have been dissatisfied with the follow-up from matters that have been raised in the House during grievance debates and, indeed, during Question Time.

Mr. Tonkin: They don't answer questions.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I could turn up examples of Government Ministers saying that they will bring down reports for members but the reports have not turned up. I think a member is clucking on the Government benches, as if this was not an important matter. However, it is of considerable importance when members of Parliament are being fobbed off during Question Time with an off-handed answer that a report will be obtained when, in fact, none turns up.

This has happened to me. The Government has its public servants primed up to go through the Loan Estimates, because when questions are raised in that debate I invariably receive answers with a varying degree of speed, depending on the department concerned. There was a time when the Engineering and Water Supply Department was particularly prompt in answering members' letters. A cause for some criticism in the administration of some departments is the length of time taken by some departments to answer members' correspondence. The Education Department would, in my case, probably be about the worst.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Oh, come on! No!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will quote an instance, because it is the most recent one that comes to mind. I refer to some letters regarding further education matters which I wrote some years ago and to which I never received a reply. I wrote to the displaced former environment chief, who became a Deputy-Director of Education, and referred to him a letter that I had received from someone in the Alexandra District.

I then realised that I should have written to the Minister. Thinking that I was probably putting this public servant in an invidious position, I telephoned him and said, "I believe it would be appropriate for the reply to come back through the Minister." I did not want to embarrass this gentleman, Dr. Inglis. He said, "Actually, I have penned a reply, and it will go through the Minister's office." It was going there, anyway. However, that reply never turned up.

That matter, which was referred to me by the member

for Alexandra months ago, related to the Mill Museum in my district. As someone was interested in it, I thought that, as this is the man who has been appointed to look after museums, I will write to him. I then realised that it would be courteous to send a letter through the Minister. However, having had letters lost in that department previously, I thought I would go direct. I then thought better of it and telephoned the man concerned. Although that gentleman said that he had written a reply, I have not received it.

This is one area in which efficiency varies from department to department. The Engineering and Water Supply Department used to be much better than it is now. It used to have a man whose name was, I think, Thomas, and whose job it was to answer letters, and they came back fairly smartly. I do not know who has this job now, but it takes much longer these days.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury): I should like to take this opportunity to comment on the present policies of the Federal Government. I have two areas of concern, the first of which is the cuts in specific purpose payments to the States and local government, and the second of which is the possible introduction of a value added tax.

The Federal Government has announced that it is cutting specific purpose grants from \$695 000 000 in the financial year just finished to \$539 000 000—a cut of 22½ per cent even before inflation is taken into account. What the Federal Government has done is cut a wide range of payments that essentially benefit the average people of this country, so that the Federal Government can continue to pay for excesses in other areas. Before last year's Federal election, when the Government needed to woo the votes of the average person, the Deputy Prime Minister said:

(There are) good and sound reasons for looking at a resources tax in respect of oil . . . and good and wise reasons for looking at the uranium industry in this respect.

The Prime Minister supported his Deputy by stating that a resources tax would also be considered on uranium to ensure "an appropriate share of uranium profits to the public sector". But that was before the election. That proposed tax has now been scrapped and the "profits to the public sector" wiped out. The votes were won; there will not be another election for three years, so the promises can be broken. And how the promises have been broken! The cuts in the specific purpose payments have taken \$42 000 000 away from the hospital development programme, leaving a paltry \$6 000 000; the community health programme is down 24 per cent to \$52 000 000; water resources projects are down from \$26 900 000 to only \$20 000 000; while welfare housing (including dwellings for pensioners) has had a massive \$70 000 000 wiped from its budget, bringing it down to \$330 000 000.

In my electoral district and the surrounding districts people have been waiting patiently for years for improved hospital facilities. The State Government has made plans for the new Para Districts Hospital. We thought work could be started this year, but earlier Federal cuts pulled the mat out from under the project. Then we thought that things could get under way next year but, if the hospitals development programme will provide only \$6 000 000 for the whole of Australia, I think the State Government is going to be forced to delay the project yet further—a blow by Fraser against the people of Salisbury.

The Deputy Premier has already announced that the completion date of the water filtration programme will now have to be delayed—another blow by Fraser against the people of Salisbury. The situation as regards pensioner

housing is no better. The South Australian Housing Trust has a number of plans for the provision of more pensioner housing in the Salisbury area. Extra accommodation for pensioners is desperately needed but, as a result of these cuts, Fraser will rest easy in his cottage at Nareen while I have to explain to a pensioner couple over 70 years of age that they will still have to wait another couple of years for trust accommodation, because the money was not there to build all the flats that are needed—Fraserism strikes again. These three blows by Fraser against the average working people of this country are just a fraction of the continuous pummelling to which he has been subjecting them since 1975.

Not satisfied with his “worker-bashing” to date, “Bovver-boy” Malcolm is toying around with a new way to steal from the poor to give to the rich—the value added tax. The Federal Government has widely hinted that such a tax will be introduced in the Budget. The Asprey Committee had recommended to the Whitlam Government that such a tax be introduced in 1974. The idea was firmly rejected, and rightly so. It has been widely mooted that, for such a tax to be worthwhile to the Government, it would have to be across the board, with very few exceptions (with food and clothing not being classed as exceptions); also, it would have to be about 8 per cent.

To give an example of how unfair such a system is, one need only consider how the tax burden will fall on people who earn different incomes and who buy the same products. In regard to food, for example, one can assume that a family with a household income of \$150 has roughly the same grocery needs as a family of the same size that earns \$300 a week or \$1 000 a week. On a \$50 basket of groceries, all these families would pay \$4 a week in value added tax—not much to the man or woman earning \$300 or \$1 000 a week, but a significant bite out of the pay packet of a person earning only \$150 a week.

To reinforce the point, one has to look only at how long it takes a wage-earner to earn the money to pay this tax. A worker on \$150 a week would have to work over an hour to pay just the tax on his groceries. Someone on \$300 a week would have earned enough to cover the tax in just over 30 minutes, while a person earning \$1 000 a week would be done in 10 minutes. Similarly, an average family car costing \$6 000 would take over three weeks wages before the tax bite had been met by the \$150 a week worker, compared to 2½ days wages for the \$1 000 a week person. Value added tax is one small step for Mal but truly one giant leap for regressive taxation.

Fraser has made life hard for the average worker. Now he is putting the squeeze on the States and local government as well to make it worse. On the one hand he reduces real wages by sleight of hand (loudly shouting about tax cuts while introducing unfair indirect taxes), then on the other hand he cuts money to State and local government so that they have less ability to provide services for the community.

If it were not for the fact that he is causing real suffering and hardship in the community one could laugh about it and say, “The grazier is getting crazier.” Instead, we have to take up the case of the hard-pressed public and fight back against Fraser’s new federalism and tax policies. I know this State Government will ably take up this struggle, as will, I am sure, the State Governments of New South Wales and Tasmania. The Liberal and National Country Parties have scant regard for the average person and his day-to-day existence, but let us hope that on this occasion Hamer, Court, and Bjelke-Petersen will take up the fight for a better deal for the wage-earner and, in the process, for State and local government as well.

Motion carried.

At 5.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 1 August at 2 p.m.